arXiv:1701.07475v1 [math.OC] 25 Jan 2017

Projected Primal-Dual Gradient Flow of Augmented Lagrangian with Application to Distributed Maximization of the Algebraic Connectivity of a Network ⋆

Han Zhang [a], Jieqiang Wei [b], Peng Yi [c], Xiaoming Hu [a],

[a] *Department of Mathematics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-100 44, Stockholm, Sweden*

[b] *Department of Automatic Control, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-100 44, Stockholm, Sweden*

[c] *Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Toronto, Canada*

Abstract

In this paper, a projected primal-dual gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian is presented to solve convex optimization problems that are not necessarily strictly convex. The optimization variables are restricted by a simple convex set as well as equality constraints. Instead of choosing to project the negative gradient flow of the objective function onto the tangent cone of the entire feasible set of the convex optimization problem, we choose to use the projected primal-dual gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian so that the dynamics only projects the negative gradient flow of the primal variables onto the tangent cone of the simple convex set. Hence the complexity of calculating the tangent cone is decreased. We show that the projected dynamical system converges to one of the optimal solutions. We further explain the connection and difference between the continuous-time algorithm and proximal gradient method. Moreover, the problem of distributedly maximizing the algebraic connectivity of an undirected graph by optimizing the edge weights (communication gains for each channel) of each nodes is considered. The original semi-definite programming (SDP) problem is relaxed into a nonlinear programming (NP) problem that will be solved by the aforementioned projected dynamical system. Numerical examples show the convergence of the aforementioned algorithm to one of the optimal solutions.

Key words: Projected Dynamical Systems, semi-definite programming, distributed optimization

1 Introduction

Recently, due to the fact of rising interest in distributed optimization, there has been a number of advances in the field of optimization that involves using continuous time dynamical systems to solve smooth convex problems, such as (Yi et al., 2016), (Gharesifard & Cortés, 2014), (Lin et al., 2016), etc, as well as nonsmooth convex problems (Qiu et al., 2016). Though it seems to be quite different from the classical iterative optimization methods, it has been found that classical methods such as steepest descent and proximal point method are nothing but forward Euler and backward Euler discretization of the same gradient flow dynamics (Parikh & Boyd, 2014). On the other hand, continuous-time algorithms enable many powerful mathematical tools to analyze the convergence of the algorithms. Hence studying continuous-time algorithms provides us with more insights about the theory behind some iterative algorithms as well as more ideas of designing them.

When solving a convex minimization problem with strong duality, it is well-known that the optimal solution is the saddle point of the Lagrangian. Hence being different from the dynamics derived from Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions in (Yang et al.) and (Liu et al., 2016), it is natural to consider the gradient flow of Lagrangians and the primal variable follows the negative gradient flow while the dual variable follows the gradient flow. Gradient flow of Lagrangians is first studied by Arrow et al. (1959), Kose (1956) and has been revisited by Feijer & Paganini (2010). (Feijer & Paganini, 2010) studies the case of strictly convex problems and provides methodologies to transform non-strictly convex problems to strictly convex problems to

⋆ This work is supported by China Scholarship Council.

Email addresses: hanzhang@kth.se (Han Zhang), jieqiang@kth.se (Jieqiang Wei), peng.yi@utoronto.ca (Peng Yi), hu@kth.se (Xiaoming Hu).

fit the framework. The convergence is shown by employing the invariance principle for hybrid automata. (Cherukuri et al., 2016) studies the same strictly convex problem from the angle of projected dynamical systems and is able to show the convergence by a Lasalle-like invariant principle for Carathéodory solutions. Instead of considering discontinuous dynamics, Durr & Ebenbauer (2011) propose a smooth vector field for seeking the saddle points of strictly convex problems. Wang & Elia (2011) consider a strictly convex problem with equality constraints and with inequality constraints respectively. Gradient flow is also used therein, however, it is worth noticing that their problem is still strictly convex. When they consider the problem with inequality constraints, logarithmic barrier function is used. Though considering nonsmooth problems, Zeng et al. (2016) use the projected gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian whose equality constraint is the variable consensus constraint, and can be viewed as a special case of our problem. Instead of using the continuous-time gradient flow, an iterative distributed augmented Lagrangian method is developed in (Chatzipanagiotis et al., 2015).

Since first introduced by Fiedler (1973), the algebraic connectivity of a graph, namely, the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix has been playing a very important role in the networked systems. Algebraic connectivity is bounded both above and below by Cheeger's constant and hence is a measure of the robustness of a graph (Mesbahi & Egerstedt, 2010). It also indicates the convergence rate of the variables consensus in multi-agent systems (Olfati-Saber et al., 2007). Hence maximizing the algebraic connectivity of a graph is an important and fundamental problem and has been considered intensively in the past. Ghosh & Boyd (2006) consider the problem of optimizing the way of adding a fixed number of edges to the graph to maximizing the algebraic connectivity. Since the problem is NP-hard, a greedy heuristic is used to solve the problem. (Göring et al., 2008) consider the problem of maximizing the algebraic connectivity by adjusting the edge weight. They explain connections between the problem and the embedding of nodes in n dimensional space. From the angle of applications, the edge weights of a graph can be treated as the gains of communication channels between the agents and we will consider a similar problem in this paper and solve it distributedly.

The main contribution of this paper is two-fold. First, we construct a projected primal-dual gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian that solves convex optimization problems which are not necessarily strictly convex. The optimization variables are restricted by a simple convex set as well as equality constraints. Using the gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian enables us to handle nonstrictly convex problems. In addition, instead of projecting the negative gradient flow of the objective function onto the tangent cone of the entire feasible set of the convex optimization problem, we employ the projected primal-dual gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian. More precisely, the dynamics only projects the negative gradient flow of the primal variable onto the tangent cone of the simple convex set. Hence the complexity of calculating the tangent cone is decreased. We show that the projected dynamical system converges to one of the optimal solutions. We find that after being discretized by forward Euler discretization, the continuous-time algorithm actually has a strong connection with iterative proximal gradient method but with iteration also on the dual variables. Second, the problem of distributedly maximizing the algebraic connectivity of an undirected graph by adjusting the edge weights (communication gain for each channel) of each nodes is considered. It is worth noticing that the problem motivates from optimizing a parameter of a graph and the communication network of the distributed optimization algorithm is actually the physical network itself; one can not "design" the communication network according to the structure of the problem or the algorithm. We solve the original problem, which is an SDP, by relaxing it into an NP problem. The NP problem is not strictly convex, hence we adapt the projected gradient flow method proposed in this work to solve the aforementioned NP problem. Numerical examples show that the aforementioned algorithm converges to one of the optimal solutions.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, some preliminaries and notations are presented. In Section 3, we introduce the problem formulation as well as the projected gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian. The convergence analysis of the projected gradient flow is presented in Section 4 and the connection and the difference between the aforementioned continuous-time algorithm and iterative proximal gradient method are also described. In Section 5, we apply the projected dynamics to distributedly solve the maximization problem of the algebraic connectivity of a network. Numerical examples are presented. The paper is concluded in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries and Notations

In this section, we introduce the notations we will use in the rest of the paper. Some basic knowledge about projected dynamical systems, convex analysis as well as SDP will also be revisited.

We denote $\mathbb{1} = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T$ as an N dimensional all-one matrix, where $\mathbf{1}$ is an N dimensional all-one vector. The element located on the ith row and and jth column of a matrix A is denoted as $[A]_{ij}$. Matrix $A_1 - A_2$ is positive semi-definite, then it will be denoted as $A_1 \succeq A_2$. We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote 2-norm of vectors. $|S|$ denotes the cardinality of set S. And any notation with the superscript $*$ denotes the optimal solution to the corresponding optimization problem. $tr(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a matrix. $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_2$ denotes the inner-product in euclidean space and

$\langle A_1, A_2\rangle_M = tr(A_1A_2)$ denotes the inner-product in $\mathcal{S}^n$, which is the Hilbert space of $n \times n$ symmetric matrix.

Assume $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed and convex set, the projection of a point x to the set K is defined as $P_K(x) = \arg\min_{y\in K} \|x - y\|$. For $x \in K$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the projection of the vector v at x with respect to K is defined as (see (Nagurney & Zhang, 2012),(Brogliato et al., 2006))

$$\Pi_K(x, v) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{P_K(x + \delta v) - x}{\delta} = P_{T_K(x)}(v), \quad (1)$$

where $T_K(x)$ denotes the tangent cone of K at x. The interior, the boundary and the closure of K is denoted as K°, ∂K and $cl(K)$ respectively.

Inward normals of K at x is defined as

$$n(x) = \big\{\gamma \mid \|\gamma\| = 1, \langle\gamma, x - y\rangle_2 \le 0, \forall y \in K\big\},$$

and $\Pi_K(x, v)$ fulfills the following lemma:

Lemma 1 (Nagurney & Zhang (2012)) *If $x \in K^\circ$, then $\Pi_K(x, v) = v$; if $x \in \partial K$, then $\Pi_K(x, v) = v + \beta(x)n^*(x)$, where $n^*(x) = \arg\max_{n\in n(x)}\langle v, -n\rangle$ and $\beta(x) = \max\{0, \langle v, -n^*(x)\rangle\}$.*

Let F be a vector field such that $F : K \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, the projected dynamical system is given in the form

$$\dot{x} = \Pi_K(x, F(x)). \quad (2)$$

Note (1), the right hand side of (2) can be discontinuous on the ∂K. Hence given an initial value $x_0 \in K$, the system (2) does not necessarily have a classical solution. However, if $F(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous, then (2) has a unique Carathéodory solution that continuously depends on the initial value (Nagurney & Zhang, 2012).

Now we introduce some basic knowledge about SDP. An SDP problem in standard form can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize } \sum_{i=1}^m c_i x_i \\ &\text{subjected to } \sum_{i=1}^m x_i A_i \preceq S, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_i, S \in \mathcal{S}^N$. Introducing the Lagrangian multiplier $\Phi \succeq 0$, the Lagrangian function of (3) can be written as

$$\mathscr{L}(x, \Phi) = -\sum_{i=1}^m c_i x_i + tr(\Phi(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i A_i - S)) \quad (3)$$

Taking the gradient of the Lagrangian function, together with the constraint and the complementarity slack condition, we get its KKT conditions

$$\langle A_i, \Phi\rangle_M = -c_i, \quad \sum_{i=1}^m x_i A_i \preceq S,$$
$$\Phi \succeq 0, \quad \langle\sum_{i=1}^m x_i A_i - S, \Phi\rangle_M = 0.$$

3 Problem Formulation and Projected Gradient Flow

In this section, we consider the following optimization problem defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{x\in K}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad Ax - b = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. K is a simple convex set, namely, it is generated by simple inequality constraints such as interval constraints and norm constraints. We assume calculating the projection on the tangent cone of K is computationally cheap. $f(x)$ is convex function but not necessarily strictly convex. It is also assumed that the gradient of $f(x)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous and the Slater's condition holds for (4). Hence strong duality holds for (4).

The Lagrangian $\mathscr{L} : K \times \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for the problem (4) is given by

$$\mathscr{L}(x, v) = f(x) + v^T(Ax - b), \quad (5)$$

where $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the Lagrangian multiplier of constraint $Ax - b = 0$. Since strong duality holds for (4), then (x^*, v^*) is a saddle point of $\mathscr{L}(x, v)$ if and only if x^* is an optimal solution to (4) and v^* is optimal solution to its dual problem. The augmented Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A} : K \times \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for (4) is given by

$$\mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x, v) = f(x)+v^T(Ax-b)+\frac{\rho}{2}(Ax-b)^T(Ax-b), \quad (6)$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the damping parameter that suppresses the oscillation of x. Without loss of generality, we choose $\rho = 1$ here.

We propose to find the saddle point of (6) via the gradient flow dynamics restricted on the set K, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \Pi_K(x, -\nabla f(x) - A^T v - A^T(Ax - b)) \\ &= \Pi_K(x, -\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x, v)}{\partial x}), \quad (7a) \\ \dot{v} &= Ax - b = \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x, v)}{\partial v}. \quad (7b) \end{aligned}$$

Note that it is assumed that $\nabla f(x)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, therefore there is a unique Carathéodory solution for the dynamics, hence the system is well-defined.

Remark 2 *Indeed, one can choose to project the negative gradient flow of the objective function onto the entire feasible set. However, this actually increases the computational complexity since it adds more constraints while computing the projection. Recall that we assume that calculating the projection to $T_K(x)$ is computationally cheap, therefore, primal-dual gradient flow is used.* □

4 Convergence Analysis

In this section, we will analyse the convergence for (7) and start with the analysis of the equilibrium point of (7).

Proposition 3 *(x^*, v^*) is the optimal solution to (4) if and only if it is an equilibrium of (7).*

PROOF. Since strong duality holds for (4), the optimality conditions become necessary and sufficient conditions. The optimality condition for (4) is given by (Ruszczyński, 2006)

$$-\nabla f(x^*) - A^T v^* \in N_K(x^*), \quad Ax^* - b = 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$-\nabla f(x^*) - A^T v^* + A^T(Ax^* - b) \in N_K(x^*),$$

where $N_K(x^*)$ denotes the normal cone of K at x^*. This implies $\Pi_K(x, -\nabla f(x) - A^T v - A^T(Ax-b)) = 0$, which is equivalent to being an equilibrium point of (7). □

Before we show the asymptotic stability of the equilibriums, we first introduce the definition of omega-limit set and a Lasalle-like invariance principle originated from (Bacciotti & Ceragioli, 2006) and simplified in (Cherukuri et al., 2015).

Definition 4 *Assume γ is a solution to $\dot{x} = f(x)$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$. The omega-limit set is defined as*

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega(\gamma) =& \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n | \exists \{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset [0, \infty), \lim_{k\to\infty} t_k = \infty, \\ & \lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma(t_k) = y\}\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Lemma 5 *(Lasalle invariance principle for Carathéodory solutions) Let $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be compact and invariant. Assume for each $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists a unique solution for $\dot{x} = f(x)$ starting at x_0 and its omega-limit set is invariant. Let $V : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable map such that $\mathcal{L}_f V(x) \leq 0$, where $\mathcal{L}_f V(x) = \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} f(x)$ denotes the Lie derivative along the vector field $f(x)$. Then any solution of $\dot{x} = f(x)$ starting at $\mathcal{S}$ converges to the largest invariant set in $cl(\{x \in \mathcal{S} | \mathcal{L}_f V(x) = 0\})$.*

Theorem 6 *Given an initial value $(x(0), v(0))$, where $x(0) \in K$, the projected dynamical system (7) asymptotically converges to some (x', v'), where x' is one of the optimal solutions of (4).*

PROOF. Suppose (x^*, v^*) is a saddle point of the Lagrangian (5), namely, x^* is the optimal solution of (4) and v^* is the optimal solution of its dual problem. Construct the following Lyapunov function

$$d(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\|x - x^*\|^2 + \|v - v^*\|^2). \tag{9}$$

Note that $d(t)$ is continuously differentiable and denote the right hand side of the dynamics (7) as vector field F. By the definition of saddle points, it holds for (x^*, v^*) that $\mathscr{L}(x^*, v) \leq \mathscr{L}(x^*, v^*) \leq \mathscr{L}(x, v^*)$. The Lie derivative of $d(t)$ along the vector field F is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) \\ &= (x - x^*)^T \Pi_K(x, -\nabla f(x) - A^T v - A^T(Ax - b)) \\ &+ (v - v^*)^T (Ax - b)\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pi_K(x, -\nabla f(x) - A^T v - A^T(Ax - b)) = \\ &-\nabla f(x) - A^T v - A^T(Ax - b) + \beta(x) n^*(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta(x) \geq 0$ and $\langle n^*(x), x - y\rangle \leq 0$, $\forall y \in K$. Since $Ax^* - b = 0$, hence it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) \\ &= (x - x^*)^T(-\nabla f(x) - A^T v - A^T(Ax - b) \\ &\quad + \beta(x) n^*(x)) + (v - v^*)^T(Ax - b) \\ &\leq (x - x^*)^T(-\nabla f(x) - A^T v - A^T(Ax - b)) \\ &\quad + (v - v^*)^T(Ax - b) \\ &= -(x - x^*)^T \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}(x, v)}{\partial x} - (Ax - b)^T(Ax - b) \\ &\quad + (v - v^*)^T \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}(x, v)}{\partial v}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathscr{L}(x, v)$ is convex with respect to x and concave with respect to v, it follows from the first order property of convex and concave function (Boyd & Vandenberghe, 2004) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) \\ &\leq \mathscr{L}(x^*, v) - \mathscr{L}(x, v^*) - (Ax - b)^T(Ax - b).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathscr{L}(x^*, v) \leq \mathscr{L}(x, v^*)$, we have $\mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) \leq -(Ax - b)^T(Ax - b) \leq 0$. Since $d(t)$ is differentiable almost everywhere with respect to t and $\frac{d}{dt}d(t) = \mathcal{L}_F d(x, v)$, $d(t)$ is non-increasing with respect to time. Note that $d(t)$ is radially unbounded, hence the set $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \{(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m | d(x, v) \leq d(x(0), v(0))\}$ is a compact invariant set for the system (7). Recall that it is assumed that $f(x)$ has locally Lipschitz continuous gradient, hence the uniqueness of the Carathéodory solution to (7) can be guaranteed. The invariance of the omega-limit set can be proved by using the same methodology as Lemma 4.1 in (Khalil & Grizzle, 2002) which is based on the continuity and the uniqueness of the solution. Now by Lemma 5, the trajectory of (7) converges to the largest invariant set in $cl(\{(x, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}} | \mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) = 0\})$.

$(x'(t), v'(t)) \in \{x \in \hat{\mathcal{S}} | \mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) = 0\}$ means $\dot{v}' = Ax' - b = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}(x^*, v) = \mathscr{L}(x, v^*) &\Leftrightarrow f(x^*) = f(x') + v^{*T}(Ax' - b) \\ &\Leftrightarrow f(x^*) = f(x').\end{aligned}$$

Since x^* is an optimal solution to (4), x' is also an optimal solution to (4). Since the set of optimal solutions is closed and v' is a constant in $\{(x, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}} | \mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) = 0\}$, $\{(x, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}} | \mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) = 0\}$ is also closed.

Denote $\mathcal{M}$ as the largest invariant set in $\{(x, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}} | \mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) = 0\}$. What remains to show is that there is no limit cycle within $\mathcal{M}$, namely, if a trajectory starts in $\mathcal{M}$, it will remain constant for all times. Assume $(\hat{x}(0), \bar{v}) \in \mathcal{M} \subset \{(x, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}} | \mathcal{L}_F d(x, v) = 0\}$, where $\bar{v}$ is a constant, then $\hat{x}(0)$ is also an optimal solution to (4). Hence there exist some $\hat{v}$ such that $(\hat{x}(0), \hat{v})$ is another saddle point of (5). Then the Lyapunov function can be constructed similarly as

$$\hat{d}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\|x - \hat{x}(0)\|^2 + \|v - \hat{v}\|^2) \tag{10}$$

We have shown that for any arbitrarily chosen saddle point (x^*, v^*), $d(t)$ is non-increasing globally; such statement also holds for $\hat{d}(t)$. Furthermore, the trajectory starts at $(\hat{x}(0), \bar{v})$ can not be time-variant, namely, $\hat{x}(t)$ remains constant for all $t > 0$. Since $\hat{d}(0) = \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{v} - \hat{v}\|^2$, it contradicts the fact that $\hat{d}(t)$ is non-increasing if $x(t)$ is time-variant.

From the analysis above, the theorem follows. □

Remark 7 *We now describe the connection between the continuous-time algorithm* (7) *and the proximal gradient method (Beck & Teboulle, 2010). As is known, the proximal operator of a convex function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is given by*

$$\text{prox}_{t\,h}(x) = \arg\min_u \{h(u) + \frac{1}{2t}\|u - x\|^2\}.$$

Consider the indicator function on K

$$I_K(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in K, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

whose proximal mapping is $\text{prox}_{t\,I_K}(x) = P_K(x) = \arg\min_{u \in K} \|u - x\|^2$.

Denote $\partial \mathscr{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(x^k, v^k)/\partial x = y^k$, by the definition of the projection (1)*, we can discretize the projected dynamical system* (7) *using forward Euler discretization*

$$(x^{k+1} - x^k)/\Delta t = (P_K\big(x^k - \Delta t y^k\big)) - x^k)/\Delta t,$$

and this gives

$$x^{k+1} = P_K(x^k - \Delta t y^k) = \text{prox}_{\Delta t\, I_K}(x^k - \Delta t y^k), \tag{11a}$$

$$v^{k+1} = v^k + \Delta t(Ax^k - b). \tag{11b}$$

Note that if one choose to project on the tangent cone of the entire feasible set $\Omega = K \bigcap \{x | Ax = b\}$, then the continuous-time dynamics will be $\dot{x} = \Pi_\Omega(x, -\nabla f(x))$. One can discretize the dynamics using forward Euler as

$$\begin{aligned} x^{k+1} &= P_\Omega(x^k - \Delta t \nabla f(x^k)) \\ &= \text{prox}_{\Delta t\, I_\Omega}(x^k - \Delta t \nabla f(x^k)), \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly proximal gradient method. Due to the fact that the gradient flow only projects on K and the introduction of the dual variable v, the iterative method (11) *is different from classical proximal gradient method. The design of Δt so that* (11) *converges to one of the optimal solutions of* (4) *will be studied in the future. Moreover, apart from forward Euler discretization, one can choose other methods such as Heun Method and Runge-Kutta Methods (Nagurney & Zhang, 2012), which will result in different iterative optimization methods.* □

Example 8 *Consider the following simple problem:*

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{x,y \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & x + 3y \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x \geq 2, \\ & x = y, \end{aligned}$$

and apply the projected system dynamics (7) *to it. The evolution of $x(t)$, $y(t)$ and $v(t)$ is illustrated in Fig. 1. The $v(0)$ and $y(0)$ are arbitrarily chosen and $x(0)$ is arbitrarily chosen among the real numbers which is greater than 2.* □

Example 9 *Now we consider a more complicated problem in (Chen, 2005):*

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{x \in \mathbb{R}^5_+}{\text{minimize}} \quad & c^T x \\ \text{subject to} \quad & Ax = b, \end{aligned}$$



Fig. 1. The evolution of $x(t)$, $y(t)$ and $v(t)$ for Example 8.

where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$b = [5, 6, 3]^T$ *and* $c = [2, 1, -1, -3, 1]^T$. *The optimal value for the problem is* $c^T x^* = -76$ *and the evolution of* $c^T x(t)$ *is shown in Fig. 2.* □



Fig. 2. The evolution of objective function for Example 9.

5 Distributed Maximization of the Algebraic Connectivity of a Network

In this section, we apply the aforementioned algorithm to maximize the algebraic connectivity of a network in a distributed manner. The problem is first formulated as an Semi-definite Programming (SDP) problem, then by employing the function (14), the problem is relaxed into an Nonlinear Programming (NP) problem.

5.1 Modeling and Problem Equivalence

An edge-weighted undirected graph is denoted as $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{W})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ denotes the vertex set; $\mathcal{E}$ denotes the edge set and $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ if vertex i and j are connected; $w_{ij} \in \mathcal{W}$, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ denotes the edge weight set. To abbreviate the notation, the edges are labelled with numbers. For instance, an edge with label l is denoted as $l \in \mathcal{E}$. The set of edges (communication channel) adjacent to node i is denoted as $\mathcal{E}(i)$. Note that $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{E}(i)$. We only consider undirected graphs, and hence the weighted Laplacian matrix L_w is symmetric and can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}[L_w]_{ij} &= \begin{cases} \sum_l w_{il} & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } (i, l) \in \mathcal{E} \\ -w_{ij} & \text{if } i \neq j \text{ and } (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{E}} w_k E_k,\end{aligned}$$

where k is the label of the edges, $0 \leq w_k \in \mathcal{W}$, $\forall k \in \mathcal{E}$ are the edge-weights. If node i and j are connected via edge k, then

$$[E_k]_{ii} = [E_k]_{jj} = 1, \quad [E_k]_{ij} = [E_k]_{ji} = -1,$$

and the other elements of E_k are zero. If the graph is connected, then the eigenvalues of L_w satisfies: $0 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_N$ and λ_2 is the algebraic connectivity of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{W})$.

Let $L = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{E}} E_k$ be the unweighted Laplacian matrix of the graph. We suppose L has only one zero eigenvalue, namely, the unweighted graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is connected. As illustrated in Fig. 3, each edge weight (the gain of communication channel) is the sum of the weight contributed by the two end nodes of the edge.

Moreover, it is also assumed that there is a limited communication resource or budget constraint for each node in the network. Without loss of generality, we assume $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} = 1$. Note that this differs from the formulation in (Göring et al., 2008), while they assume $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{E}} w_k = 1$, if written in the form of our model, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} = 1$. Then maximizing the algebraic connectivity of the edge-weighted Laplacian matrix by adjusting the edge-weights can be formulated as the following SDP problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\lambda_2, \mu, \{w_k^{(i)}\}}{\text{maximize}} \quad & \lambda_2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \lambda_2 I - \mu \mathbb{1} \preceq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} E_k, \\ & \sum_{k \in \mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} = 1, \\ & w_k^{(i)} \geq 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{E}, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}. \end{aligned} \tag{$\mathrm{P_c}$}$$

In ($\mathrm{P_c}$), the variable μ is used to shift the zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix L_w with its eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$. When

the optimal value is reached, λ_2^* would be the smallest eigenvalue of $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}} w_k^{(i)*}E_k + \mu^*\mathbb{1}$. Since for any positive semi-definite matrix G, it holds that $\xi I \preceq G$, where ξ is the smallest eigenvalue of G, we get the above constraints. Moreover, since λ_2^* is the smallest eigenvalue of $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}} w_k^{(i)*}E_k + \mu^*\mathbb{1}$, the optimal value of ($\mathrm{P_c}$) can be attained. On the other hand, we can choose λ_2 small enough and μ large enough to make the first matrix inequality constraint strictly holds, hence strong duality holds for ($\mathrm{P_c}$). In order to solve ($\mathrm{P_c}$) distributedly, we



Fig. 3. Edge weight is the sum of weight contribution by the nodes.

consider the following problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\underset{\{\mu^{(i)}\},\{w_k^{(i)}\},\{Z^{(i)}\}}{\text{maximize}} \quad & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}}\lambda_2^{(i)} \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \lambda_2^{(i)}I - \mu^{(i)}\mathbb{1} - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)}E_k \\
& + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)} (Z^{(i)} - Z^{(j)}) \preceq 0, \\
& \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} = 1, \\
& w_k^{(i)} \geq 0,\ \forall k \in \mathcal{E}(i), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V},
\end{aligned} \tag{$\mathrm{P_D}$}$$

where $Z^{(i)}, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}$ are symmetric matrices which can be written as $Z^{(i)} = \sum_{l=1}^{\frac{N(N+1)}{2}} z_l^{(i)} B_l$, where $z_l^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the matrix entry and B_l is the basis matrix for $\mathcal{S}^N$. Both are labeled by l. To be more precise, if $z_l^{(i)}$ is the entry located on pth row and qth column of $Z^{(i)}$, then $[B_l]_{pq} = [B_l]_{qp} = 1$ and other entries of B_l remain zeros. The idea behind the introduction of $Z^{(i)}$ terms is that it will result in a consensus condition (13f) in the KKT conditions.

It is worth noticing that the Slater's conditions holds also for ($\mathrm{P_D}$) which implies strong duality.

Proposition 10 *If* $\{\lambda_2^{(i)*}, \mu^{(i)*}, \{w_k^{(i)*}\}, Z^{(i)*}\}$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$ *solves* ($\mathrm{P_D}$), *then* $\lambda_2^* = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}} \lambda_2^{(i)*}$, $\mu^* = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}} \mu^{(i)*}$ *solves* ($\mathrm{P_c}$).

PROOF. By following the same procedure introduced in Section 2, it is not hard to get the KKT conditions of ($\mathrm{P_c}$):

$$tr(\Phi^*) = 1,\ \Phi^* \succeq 0,\ \varphi_k^{(i)*} \geq 0,\ tr(\mathbb{1}\Phi^*) = 0, \tag{12a}$$
$$tr(E_k\Phi^*) - v^{(i)*} + \varphi_k^{(i)*} = 0,\ w_k^{(i)*} \geq 0, \tag{12b}$$
$$\varphi_k^{(i)*} w_k^{(i)*} = 0,\ \forall k \in \mathcal{E}(i), \tag{12c}$$
$$\lambda_2^* - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)*} tr(E_k\Phi^*) = 0, \tag{12d}$$
$$\lambda_2^* I - \mu^*\mathbb{1} - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)*}E_k \preceq 0, \tag{12e}$$
$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)*} = 1, \tag{12f}$$

while the KKT conditions of ($\mathrm{P_D}$) for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ reads

$$tr(\Phi^{(i)*}) = 1, \Phi^{(i)*} \succeq 0, \varphi_k^{(i)*} \geq 0, tr(\mathbb{1}\Phi^{(i)*}) = 0, \tag{13a}$$
$$tr(E_k\Phi^{(i)*}) - v^{(i)*} + \varphi_k^{(i)*} = 0,\ w_k^{(i)*} \geq 0, \tag{13b}$$
$$\varphi_k^{(i)*} w_k^{(i)*} = 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{E}(i), \tag{13c}$$
$$\lambda_2^{(i)*} - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)*} tr(E_k\Phi^{(i)*}) + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)} tr[(Z^{(i)} - Z^{(j)})\Phi^{(i)}] = 0, \tag{13d}$$
$$\lambda_2^{(i)*} I - \mu^{(i)*}\mathbb{1} - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)*}E_k + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)} (Z^{(i)*} - Z^{(j)*}) \preceq 0, \tag{13e}$$
$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)*} = 1, \quad \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)} \Phi^{(i)*} - \Phi^{(j)*} = 0, \tag{13f}$$

where Φ, φ_k and v are the Lagrange multipliers correspond to the matrix inequality constraint, inequality constraints and the equality constraint of ($\mathrm{P_c}$) respectively. Similarly, $\Phi^{(i)}$, $\varphi_k^{(i)}$ and $v^{(i)}$ are the Lagrange multipliers of ($\mathrm{P_D}$).

Since strong duality holds for ($\mathrm{P_D}$), then the KKT conditions (13) becomes necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality. Hence $\{\lambda_2^{(i)*}, \mu^{(i)*}, \{w_k^{(i)*}\}, Z^{(i)*}\}$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$ solves ($\mathrm{P_D}$), if and only if there exists Lagrange multipliers $\{\Phi^{(i)*}\}$ and $\{\varphi_k^{(i)*}\}$ such that (13) holds.

Meanwhile, (13f) implies $\Phi^{(i)*} = \Phi^{(j)*}$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$. This means that (12a)-(12b) are equivalent to (13a)-(13b). Further, by adding (13d) and (13e) for each node $i \in \mathcal{V}$, the terms $tr[(Z^{(i)} - Z^{(j)})\Phi^{(i)}]$ and $Z^{(i)*} - Z^{(j)*}$ will disappear. Denote $\lambda_2^* = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}} \lambda_2^{(i)*}$, $\mu^* = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}} \mu^{(i)*}$, we will get (12). Since strong duality holds for ($\mathrm{P_c}$), then KKT conditions is necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality. Hence the statement follows. □

5.2 Relaxing SDP into NP

($\mathrm{P_D}$) can be solved distributedly by using a similar method as (Zhang & Hu, 2016) when the graph is regular. However, we would like to consider arbitrary graphs, not only regular graphs. In order to apply the projected gradient flow dynamics to solve ($\mathrm{P_D}$), the problem is relaxed into an NP first.

Now we introduce the convex function proposed by Nesterov (2007) which can be used to approximate the largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix. Given $X \in \mathcal{S}^N$, function $f_\varepsilon : \mathcal{S}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and reads

$$f_\varepsilon(X) = \varepsilon \ln tr(e^{X/\varepsilon}) = \varepsilon \ln[\sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{\lambda_i(X)/\varepsilon}], \tag{14}$$

and its derivative with respect to X reads

$$\nabla_X f_\varepsilon(X) = [\sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{\lambda_i(X)/\varepsilon}]^{-1}[\sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{\lambda_i(X)/\varepsilon} u_i u_i^T], \tag{15}$$

where $(\lambda_i(X), u_i)$ are eigen-pairs of X with $\|u_i\| = 1, \forall i$. It has been proved by Nesterov (2007) that $\lambda_{\max}(X) \leq f_\varepsilon(X) \leq \lambda_{\max}(X) + \varepsilon \ln N$. Hence when ε is sufficiently small, $f_\varepsilon(X) \approx \lambda_{\max}(X)$.

Note the matrix inequality constraint in ($\mathrm{P_D}$) means nothing but $-\lambda_2^{(i)}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $-\mu^{(i)}\mathbb{1} - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}} w_k^{(i)} E_k + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)}(Z^{(i)} - Z^{(j)})$ (Boyd & Vandenberghe, 2004). Hence when choosing ε small, SDP ($\mathrm{P_D}$) can be relaxed into the following NP

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\{\mu^{(i)}\},\{w_k^{(i)}\},\{Z^{(i)}\}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}} f_\varepsilon(X^{(i)}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} = 1 \\ & w_k^{(i)} \geq 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{E}(i), \end{aligned} \tag{NP}$$

where $X^{(i)} = -\mu^{(i)}\mathbb{1} - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} E_k + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)}(Z^{(i)} - Z^{(j)})$ to abbreviate the notation. It is clear that the Slater's condition also holds for (NP) and hence strong duality holds. Therefore, KKT conditions becomes necessary and sufficient conditions for (NP) problem.

Remark 11 (NP) *explains the reason of the introduction of μ in* ($\mathrm{P_c}$) *instead of writing the constraint as $\lambda_2(I - \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{1}) \preceq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} E_k$ as in (Ghosh & Boyd, 2006). A $\lambda_2 I$ term is needed for the relaxation. It is worth noticing that μ^* does not necessarily equals to λ_2^*/N in* ($\mathrm{P_c}$). *In fact, any $(\lambda_2^*, \mu^*, \{w_k^{(i)*}\})$ such that $\mu^* \geq \lambda_2^*/N$ is an optimal solution for* ($\mathrm{P_c}$). □

Remark 12 *Though convex, $f_\varepsilon(X)$ is not a strictly convex function. For all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha f_\varepsilon(I) + (1-\alpha) f_\varepsilon(2I) &= \alpha\varepsilon \ln(Ne^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}) + (1-\alpha)\varepsilon \ln(Ne^{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}) \\ &= \varepsilon \ln N + 2 - \alpha \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varepsilon(\alpha I + (1-\alpha)2I) = f_\varepsilon((2-\alpha)I) &= \varepsilon \ln(Ne^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\varepsilon}}) \\ &= \varepsilon \ln N + 2 - \alpha \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\alpha f_\varepsilon(I) + (1-\alpha) f_\varepsilon(2I) = f_\varepsilon(\alpha I + (1-\alpha)2I)$, $f_\varepsilon(X)$ is not strictly convex. □

5.3 Projected Dynamics and Numerical Examples

Now we apply the projected dynmaical system to solve ($\mathrm{P_c}$). To abbreviate the notation, denote $x = \left[x^{(1)T}, \cdots, x^{(N)T}\right]^T$, where $x^{(i)} = \left[\mu^{(i)}, \{w_k^{(i)}\}, \{z_l^{(i)}\}\right]^T$ and $v = \left[v^{(1)}, \cdots, v^{(N)}\right]^T$.

The projected dynamics is given by

$$\dot{\mu}^{(i)} = \langle \nabla_{X^{(i)}} f_\varepsilon(X^{(i)}), \mathbb{1}\rangle_M = -\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x,v)}{\partial \mu^{(i)}}, \tag{16a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w}_k^{(i)} &= \Pi_{\mathbb{R}_+}\big(w_k^{(i)}, \langle \nabla_{X^{(i)}} f_\varepsilon(X^{(i)}), E_k\rangle_M - v^{(i)} \\ &\quad - (\sum_{l\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_l^{(i)} - 1)\big) \\ &= \Pi_{\mathbb{R}_+}(w_k^{(i)}, -\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x,v)}{\partial w_k^{(i)}}), \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{E}(i) \end{aligned} \tag{16b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_l^{(i)} &= -\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)} \langle \nabla_{X^{(i)}} f_\varepsilon(X^{(i)}) - \nabla_{X^{(j)}} f_\varepsilon(X^{(j)}), B_l\rangle_M \\ &= -\frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x,v)}{\partial z_l^{(i)}}, \end{aligned} \tag{16c}$$

$$\dot{v}^{(i)} = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} - 1 = \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x,v)}{\partial v^{(i)}}, \tag{16d}$$

where $\mathscr{L}_\mathcal{A}(x,v) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{V}}\{f_\varepsilon(X^{(i)}) + v^{(i)}(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} - 1) + \frac{1}{2}(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{E}(i)} w_k^{(i)} - 1)^2\}$ and $\nabla_{X^{(i)}} f_\varepsilon(X^{(i)})$ is given by (15).

Corollary 13 *The system* (16) *is well-defined and asymptotically stable with x converging to one of the optimal solutions.*

PROOF. $f_\varepsilon(X)$ has a Lipschitz continuous gradient with respect to x given that $X = \sum_i x_i A_i$, where all A_i are symmetric matrices (Nesterov, 2007). By Theorem 2.5 in (Nagurney & Zhang, 2012), for any initial value $\mu^{(i)}(0) \in \mathbb{R}$, $w_k^{(i)}(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $v^{(i)}(0) \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique Carathéodory solution which continuously depends on the initial value. Therefore the system (16)

is well-defined and by Theorem 6, the system (16) is asymptotically stable with x converging to the optimal solution. □

Though it seems that when simulating the projected dynamics (16), one has to do eigenvalue decomposition on $X^{(i)}$ to compute $\nabla_{X^{(i)}} f(X^{(i)})$ at each time step. However, since the factors $e^{\lambda_i(X^{(i)})/\varepsilon}$ decrease very rapidly, the gradient numerically only depends on few largest eigenvalues and correpondant eigenvectors (Nesterov, 2007). More precisely, for sufficiently small ε, $\nabla_{X^{(i)}} f(X^{(i)}) \approx \frac{1}{\eta}\sum_j u_j^{(i)} u_j^{(i)T}$, where $u_j^{(i)}$ is the eigenvector corresponds to the largest eigenvalue, η is the multiplicity of the largest eigenvalue of $X^{(i)}$. Extreme eigenvalues will converge first in numerical methods such as Lanszos scheme, hence one does not have to do the entire eigenvalue decomposition and the numerical complexity is reduced.

Example 14 *We run a simple numerical example using the graph illustrated in Fig. 3 to show that the variables do converge to the optimal solutions. We know that the optimal solution of* $(\mathrm{P_c})$ *is* $w_1^{(1)*} = w_2^{(3)*} = 1$, $w_1^{(2)*} = w_2^{(2)*} = 0.5$ *and* $\lambda_2^* = 1.5$. *Fig. 4 and 5 show that the objective function value and the edge weights converge to the optimal solution.* □



Fig. 4. The evolution of the objective function

Example 15 *Now we consider a more complicated graph generated by ten nodes as illustrated in Fig. 6 The evolution of the objective function is illustrated in Fig. 7. It shows that the objective function converges to the optimal value asymptotically.* □

6 Conclusion

In this paper, a projected primal-dual gradient flow of augmented Lagrangian is presented to solve convex optimization problems which are not necessarily strictly convex. We show that the projected dynamical system converges to one of the optimal solutions. The connection and difference between the aforementioned continuous-time algorithm and proximal gradient method is further explained. Moreover, the problem of distributedly maximizing the algebraic connectivity of an undirected graph by adjusting the edge weights (communication gains for each channel) of each nodes is considered. The original SDP problem is relaxed into an NP problem and then the aforementioned projected dynamical system is applied to solve the NP. Numerical examples show that the projected dynamical systems converge to one of the optimal solutions.



Fig. 5. The evolution of the edge weights



Fig. 6. Graph Topology



Fig. 7. The evolution of the objective function

References

Arrow, K.-J., Hurwicz, L., Uzawa, H., Chenery, H.-B., Johnson, S.-M., Karlin, S., & Marschak, T. (1959). Studies in linear and non-linear programming., .

Bacciotti, A., & Ceragioli, F. (2006). Nonpathological lyapunov functions and discontinuous carathéodory systems. *Automatica*, *42*, 453–458.

Beck, A., & Teboulle, M. (2010). 1 gradient-based algorithms with applications to signal recovery problems. *Convex Optimization in Signal Processing and Communications*, .

Boyd, S., & Vandenberghe, L. (2004). *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press.

Brogliato, B., Daniilidis, A., Lemaréchal, C., & Acary, V. (2006). On the equivalence between complementarity systems, projected systems and differential inclusions. *Systems & Control Letters*, *55*, 45–51.

Chatzipanagiotis, N., Dentcheva, D., & Zavlanos, M. M. (2015). An augmented lagrangian method for distributed optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, *152*, 405–434.

Chen, B. (2005). *Optimization Theory and Algorithms*. Tsinghua University press.

Cherukuri, A., Mallada, E., & Cortés, J. (2015). Convergence of caratheodory solutions for primal-dual dynamics in constrained concave optimization. In *SIAM conference on control and its applications*. SIAM.

Cherukuri, A., Mallada, E., & Cortés, J. (2016). Asymptotic convergence of constrained primal–dual dynamics. *Systems & Control Letters*, *87*, 10–15.

Durr, H.-B., & Ebenbauer, C. (2011). A smooth vector field for saddle point problems. In *CDC-ECE* (pp. 4654–4660).

Feijer, D., & Paganini, F. (2010). Stability of primal–dual gradient dynamics and applications to network optimization. *Automatica*, *46*, 1974–1981.

Fiedler, M. (1973). Algebraic connectivity of graphs. *Czechoslovak mathematical journal*, *23*, 298–305.

Gharesifard, B., & Cortés, J. (2014). Distributed continuous-time convex optimization on weight-balanced digraphs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, *59*, 781–786.

Ghosh, A., & Boyd, S. (2006). Growing well-connected graphs. In *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control* (pp. 6605–6611). IEEE.

Göring, F., Helmberg, C., & Wappler, M. (2008). Embedded in the shadow of the separator. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, *19*, 472–501.

Khalil, H. K., & Grizzle, J. (2002). *Nonlinear systems*. (3rd ed.). Prentice hall New Jersey.

Kose, T. (1956). Solutions of saddle value problems by differential equations. *Econometrica, Journal of the Econometric Society*, (pp. 59–70).

Lin, P., Ren, W., & Farrell, J. A. (2016). Distributed continuous-time optimization: Nonuniform gradient gains, finite-time convergence, and convex constraint set. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, .

Liu, Q., Yang, S., & Wang, J. (2016). A collective neurodynamic approach to distributed constrained optimization, .

Mesbahi, M., & Egerstedt, M. (2010). *Graph theoretic methods in multiagent networks*. Princeton University Press.

Nagurney, A., & Zhang, D. (2012). *Projected dynamical systems and variational inequalities with applications* volume 2. Springer Science & Business Media.

Nesterov, Y. (2007). Smoothing technique and its applications in semidefinite optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, *110*, 245–259.

Olfati-Saber, R., Fax, J. A., & Murray, R. M. (2007). Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, *95*, 215–233.

Parikh, N., & Boyd, S. (2014). Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, *1*, 127–239.

Qiu, Z., Liu, S., & Xie, L. (2016). Distributed constrained optimal consensus of multi-agent systems. *Automatica*, *68*, 209–215.

Ruszczyński, A. P. (2006). *Nonlinear optimization*. Princeton University Press.

Wang, J., & Elia, N. (2011). A control perspective for centralized and distributed convex optimization. In *2011 50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference* (pp. 3800–3805). IEEE.

Yang, S., Liu, Q., & Wang, J. (). A multi-agent system with a proportional-integral protocol for distributed constrained optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, .

Yi, P., Hong, Y., & Liu, F. (2016). Initialization-free distributed algorithms for optimal resource allocation with feasibility constraints and application to economic dispatch of power systems. *Automatica*, *74*, 259 – 269.

Zeng, X., Yi, P., & Hong, Y. (2016). Distributed continuous-time algorithm for constrained convex optimizations via nonsmooth analysis approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, *PP*. doi:10.1109/TAC.2016.2628807.

Zhang, H., & Hu, X. (2016). Consensus control for linear systems with optimal energy cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.00316*, .